



U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
ULLB, 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536



HI

File: [Redacted] Office: PORTLAND, OR

Date:

MAR 12 2001

IN RE: Applicant:



Application: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(i)

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT: SELF-REPRESENTED

Public Copy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

Identification data deleted to prevent clearly and accurately invasion of personal privacy.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Acting Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Portland, Oregon, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under § 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having attempted to procure admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation in 1988. In 1989, the applicant married a native and citizen of Mexico who subsequently became a lawful permanent resident of the United States in 1990. The applicant seeks the above waiver in order to remain in the United States and reside with her spouse and children.

The district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant states that she does not agree with the district director's decision and is determined that she be given a chance to prove that the decision is unfair. The applicant states that she has two sons and a husband in the United States who want her to live here and that she filed a waiver application with supporting documents.

The record reflects that the applicant was stopped by the U.S. Border Patrol near the California/Mexico border on October 2, 1988. At that time, she falsely claimed to be a citizen of the United States by presenting a U.S. birth certificate belonging to another person. The applicant initially claimed that her name was [REDACTED] and that she was born in Davis, California on February 24, 1968. The applicant eventually admitted to having jumped the line near Calexico, California and stated that she had obtained the birth certificate from [REDACTED] with whom she had sought a ride to Los Angeles in exchange for paying gas. The applicant revealed her true identity as [REDACTED] a native and citizen of Mexico, born in Zacatecos, Mexico on March 14, 1971, the daughter of [REDACTED]. The applicant was returned to Mexico that same day. She subsequently reentered the United States without inspection in December 1989 after having married her husband in Mexico in October 1989.

The applicant asserts that she is not the person who was stopped by the Border Patrol on October 2, 1988 and that someone else must have given her name to protect their identity. In support of her assertions, the applicant has submitted affidavits from her brother-in-law, a municipal delegate and an employer from the community of La Palma, Valparaiso, Zacatecas, Mexico. The affidavits indicate that the applicant remained in her community at the home of her parents until marrying her husband in 1989.

Section 212(a) CLASSES OF ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS OR ADMISSION.-Except as otherwise provided in this Act, aliens who are inadmissible under the following paragraphs are ineligible to receive visas and ineligible to be admitted to the United States:

(6) ILLEGAL ENTRANTS AND IMMIGRATION VIOLATORS.-

(C) MISREPRESENTATION.-

(i) IN GENERAL.-Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) ADMISSION OF IMMIGRANT INADMISSIBLE FOR FRAUD OR WILLFUL MISREPRESENTATION OF MATERIAL FACT.-

(1) The Attorney General may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the refusal of admission to the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

(2) No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision or action of the Attorney General regarding a waiver under paragraph (1).

In 1986, Congress expanded the reach of the ground of inadmissibility in the Immigration Marriage Fraud Amendments of 1986, P.L. No. 99-639, and redesignated as § 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act by the Immigration Act of 1990 (Pub. L. No. 101-649, Nov. 29, 1990, 104 Stat. 5067) effective June 1, 1991. Congress imposed the statutory bar on (a) those who made oral or written misrepresentations in seeking admission into the United States; (b) those who have made material misrepresentations in seeking admission into the United States or "other benefits" provided under the Act; and (c) it made the amended statute applicable to the receipt of visas by, and the admission of, aliens occurring after the date of the enactment based on fraud or misrepresentation occurring before, on, or after such date.

In 1990, § 274C of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1324c, was inserted by the Immigration Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-649, Nov. 29, 1990, 104 Stat. 5059), effective for persons or entities that have committed violations on or after November 29, 1990. Section 274C(a) provided penalties for document fraud stating that it is unlawful for any person or entity knowingly-

(2) to use, attempt to use, possess, obtain, accept, or receive or to provide any forged, counterfeit, altered, or falsely made document in order to satisfy any requirement of this Act,....

In 1994 Congress passed the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act (P.L. 103-322, September 13, 1994), which enhanced the criminal penalties of certain offenses, including 18 U.S.C. 1546:

(a)...Impersonation in entry document or admission application; evading or trying to evade immigration laws using assumed or fictitious name...knowingly making false statement under oath about material fact in immigration application or document....

(b) Knowingly using false or unlawfully issued document or false attestation to satisfy the Act provision on verifying whether employee is authorized to work.

The penalty for a violation under (a) increased from up to 5 years imprisonment and a fine or both to up to 10 years imprisonment and a fine or both. The penalty for a violation under (b) increased from up to 2 years imprisonment or a fine or both to up to 5 years imprisonment or a fine, or both.

In 1996, Congress expanded the document fraud liability to those who engage in document fraud for the purpose of obtaining a benefit under the Act. Congress also restricted § 212(i) of the Act in a number of ways with the recent IIRIRA amendments. First, immigrants who are parents of U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident children can no longer apply for this waiver. Second, the immigrant must now show that refusing him or her admission would cause extreme hardship to the qualifying relative. Third, Congress eliminated the alternative 10-year provision for immigrants who failed to have qualifying relatives. Fourth, Congress eliminated judicial review of § 212(i) waiver decisions; and fifth, a child is no longer a qualifying relative.

After reviewing the amendments to the Act and to other statutes regarding fraud and misrepresentation from 1957 to the present time, and after noting the increased penalties Congress has placed on such activities, including the narrowing of the parameters for eligibility, the re-inclusion of the perpetual bar and eliminating children as a consideration in determining the presence of extreme hardship, it is concluded that Congress has placed a high priority on reducing and/or stopping fraud and misrepresentation related to immigration and other matters.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission resulting from § 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. Although extreme hardship is a

requirement for § 212(i) relief, once established, it is but one favorable discretionary factor to be considered. See Matter of Mendez, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

In Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, Interim Decision 3380 (BIA 1999), the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) stipulated that the factors deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to § 212(i) of the Act include, but are not limited to, the following: the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative's ties in such countries; the financial impact of departure from this country; and finally, significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

In Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, the Board also held that the underlying fraud or misrepresentation may be considered as an adverse factor in adjudicating a § 212(i) waiver application in the exercise of discretion. Matter of Tijam, Interim Decision 3372 (BIA 1998), followed. The Board declined to follow the policy set forth by the Commissioner in Matter of Alonso, 17 I&N Dec. 292 (Comm. 1979); Matter of Da Silva, 17 I&N Dec. 288 (Comm. 1979), and noted that the United States Supreme Court ruled in INS v. Yueh-Shaio Yang, 519 U.S. 26 (1996), that the Attorney General has the authority to consider any and all negative factors, including the respondent's initial fraud.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has failed to substantiate her assertions that she is not inadmissible to the United States. Her statement and the affidavits submitted do not overcome the evidence contained in the record. In addition, the applicant has failed to provide any evidence that her removal from the United States would result in extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under § 212(i) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. See Matter of T-S-Y-, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957). Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.